

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-28 are all the claims pending in the application.

The specification has been amended to correct the descriptions of reference numbers, particularly Figure 9. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully requested that this amendment be entered.

Figure 9 of the drawings is objected to for referencing "21" which is not mentioned in the specification. In response, Applicants have amended the specification to correct the descriptions of reference numbers. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herron et al. (US 5,556,716) in view of Kesting (US 4,450,126).

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse.

In Applicant's Amendment filed February 26, 2003, claim 1 was amended to incorporate the recitations of dependent claim 3. Applicants stated that the cited references do not disclose a variant of nylon that is radio-conductive, and therefore, do not provide sufficient basis for one of ordinary skill to have arrived at the claimed invention. An alcohol-soluble nylon is not suggested since Herron teaches a method for producing BiI₃-Nylon using a solid phase method. Herron does not teach or suggest a composite material of nylon 6 and nylon 66. Heron merely teaches nylon 11, nylon 12, and the like. Therefore, the present claims are not unpatentable in view of Herron, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Further, any suggestion of obviousness is clearly rebutted as set forth by experimental data of unexpected superiority in Applicants' specification. Applicants have found that a radio-

conductive material having unexpectedly superior properties can be obtained by using the composite of nylon 6 and nylon 66 (see Table 1 on page 28 of the specification, and the accompanying description in the text).

As shown in Table 1 (page 28) of the present specification, the material of the present invention exhibits superior conductivity properties as a radio-conductive material, compared with nylon 11, which is used in Herron. The present claims are directed to a specific variant of nylon, and Herron neither discloses nor suggests Applicants' specifically claimed composition. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 25, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,556,716 ("Herron").

In the prior Action, it was stated that Applicants admit that indium electrodes are known in the art. (fourth paragraph on pg. 6 of remarks filed February 26, 2003)

This is a mischaracterization of the Amendment. Page 6 of Applicants' February 26 Amendment does not state that indium electrodes were known, and Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on this basis.

The Examiner takes the position that Herron discloses that metal electrodes could be used but does not explicitly list all known metal electrodes, but it would have been within the routine skill of one having ordinary skill to select indium from the plurality of known metal electrodes. It is asserted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide indium as the metal for the electrode (70) in the solid sensor of Herron in order to form a metallic conductive electrode.

Applicants respectfully do not agree that the disclosure of a metal electrode renders obvious the use of an indium electrode. Also, the Examiner does not appear to have addressed Applicants' argument that Herron discloses using gold as the electrode, which is known to have a better conductivity, and which therefore teaches away from using indium.

In regard to claim 28 which is dependent on claim 25, Herron is asserted to disclose a radiation image read-out apparatus (column 1, line 53 to column 2, line 4) comprising the solid sensor defined in claim 25 and a read-out means for reading out a radiation image recorded on the solid sensor as a latent radiation image.

In response, Applicants respectfully traverse because a *prima facie* obviousness rejection has not been established.

Applicants strenuously disagree with the characterization of indium as an obvious choice for the electrode of Applicants' claims. The citation of Webster's Dictionary does not provide any motivation why one of ordinary skill would modify Herron to specifically include an *indium* electrode. The mere fact that indium was known as a metal at the time of Applicants' invention does not provide a basis selection of indium in Applicants' claims.

Moreover, even if the use of an indium for electrodes were known at the time the present application was filed, it would not have been obvious to select an indium electrode specifically for the solid sensor of Applicants' claims.

The inventor has discovered that when an indium electrode is used for a solid sensor, the solid sensor provides unexpectedly superior performance as shown in Fig. 13. At the time of the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Appln. No. 09/777,682

present invention, it would not have been expected to use indium, which is much less conductive than gold, for an electrode in a solid sensor.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Keith B. Scala
Registration No. 43,088

Date: September 25, 2003